

#9

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

TOMITA

Application No.: 09/240,007

Filed: January 29, 1999



Group Art Unit: 2818

Examiner: H. Hoang

Attorney Dkt. No.: 100353-09002

RECEIVED

JAN 08 2001

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE RECONCILING DIFFERENT TIMING SIGNALS

**PETITION TO WITHDRAW PATENT APPLICATION FROM ISSUE
AFTER PAYMENT OF ISSUE FEE UNDER 37 CFR 1.313(b)(5)**

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

January 5, 2001

Sir:

Applicant petitions to withdraw the above referenced patent application from issue after payment of the issue fee to permit consideration of an information disclosure statement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97 in a continuing application as permitted by 37 C.F.R. §1.313(b)(5).

A check in the amount of \$130.00 as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(i) is enclosed. If any further fee is due to effect grant of this Petition, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

It is respectfully submitted that the requirements of 37 CFR 1.313 are satisfied.

01/08/2001 CNGUYEN 00000078 09240007

02 FC:122

130.00 OP

Respectfully submitted,


Rustan J. Hill
Registration No. 37,351

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

(Translation)

Delivery No.: 9-5-2000-032094194
Delivery Date: December 6, 2000
Response Deadline: February 6, 2001



#9
RECEIVED

JAN 0 8 2001

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

NOTICE REQUESTING SUBMISSION OF OPINION

Applicant(s): FUJITSU LIMITED
1-1, Kamikodanaka 4-chome, Nakahara-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa, 211-8588, Japan

Attorney(s) for Applicant(s): Lee International Attorney(s)
Kukdong Bldg., 14th Fl., 60-1 Chungmuro 3-Ka
Chung-Ku, Seoul 100-705, Republic of Korea

Case: Patent Application No. 10-1999-0003490

For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE RECONCILING DIFFERENT TIMING SIGNALS

The following grounds to reject the above-identified application have been found as a result of examination of the application. If there shall be any argument against this Notice and/or any amendment to the application, the applicant is invited to submit the argument pursuant to Article 63 of the Patent Law and/or the amendment pursuant to Article 47, Paragraph 2 (3) of the same Law, to this Office by the deadline as noted above. (This time limit can be indefinitely extended, on a monthly basis, upon request. This Office shall not issue any official notices regarding any requests for extension.)

GROUND S

The invention claimed in Claims 1, 8, 18 and 34 is considered easily conceivable by one skilled in the art, prior to the filing of the present application, in view of the "Remarks" set forth below. Thus, the claimed invention can not be patented, in view of Article 29, Paragraph 2 of the Patent Law.

The present application is considered as being defective for the reason set forth in the "Remarks" below, and thus violate Article 42, Paragraph 4 of the Patent Law.

REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 8, 18 and 34 are directed to a semiconductor device capable of processing data at high speed and a method of writing data, which are each characterized by comprising a control circuit for latching a corresponding address in response to a clock signal and a control circuit for latching a corresponding address in response to a strobe signal. However, the claimed invention is similar in constitution and in effect to Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No. Hei 7-141870 (June 2, 1995) disclosing a semiconductor device for processing data at high speed by a clock signal and an internal signal.

2. Claim 18 does not specifically describe the constitution of each of the address-input circuit and the data-input circuit.

This 6th day of December, 2000

Patent Examiner (sealed)
Examining Board IV
Korean Intellectual Property Office

Document Annexed : Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No. Hei 7-141870 (June 2, 1995)

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

AA. The examiner rejected Claims 1, 8, 18 to 34 as being obvious, in view of Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No. Hei 7-141870.

To overcome this obviousness rejection, we will have to explain the differences between the cited reference and the claimed invention in terms of their respective constitutions and advantageous effects. Thus, please provide us with your explanations on how to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference.

BB. The examiner rejected Claim 18 on the ground that it fails to specify the constitution of each of the address-input circuit and the data-input circuit.

We believe that the constitution of the address-input circuit and the data-input circuit is described in detail in the specification [page 12, line 26 through page 15, line 15 (Fig. 1, 2, 3) and page 32 line 7 through page 36 line 25 (Fig. 12, 13, 14) of the English text, respectively]. Please provide us with your thoughts and instructions in this regard.